

REMARKS

I. Preliminary Remarks

A. Amended Title

The title has been amended to be directed to the subject matter currently being claimed as suggested by the Examiner.

B. Applicants' Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiners Dang and Landsman for their time in the telephonic interview with the undersigned and the Applicants attorney David A. Gass on November 14, 2008. The double-patenting rejections were discussed.

C. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the allowability of claims 46, 48, 62, 67, 72-75 and 78-98 in the office action mailed October 16, 2008.

D. Explanation of Amendments to the Claims

Claims 63, 64, 68 and 77 have been amended to delete references to canceled claims and are now dependent upon claims indicated as being allowable by the Examiner. Claims 62 and 67 are amended to improve antecedent basis. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the amendments to claims 62, 63, 64, 67, 68 and 77. The amendments are believed to place these claims in condition for allowance.

The amendments to or cancellation of claims presented herein are made solely to expedite issuance and not for reasons pertaining to patentability. Applicants maintain all previous arguments and do not intend by these or any other amendments to abandon the subject matter of any claim as originally filed, and reserve the right to pursue such subject matter in this or related applications, including but not limited to parent and continuing applications.

II. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 68 and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because the claims were dependent upon cancelled

claim 66. The rejections are moot in view of the amendments made herein. Specifically, claims 68 and 77 as amended herein are dependent upon claims 67 and 72, respectively. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 68 and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

III. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections are moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 50-53, 61, 63 and 64 as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 10, 11, 12, 17, 32, 33, 34 and 53 of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,777. The rejection is moot in view of the amendments made herein. Specifically, claims 50-53 and 61 have been canceled. Claims 63 and 64 as amended herein are dependent upon claim 62, which the Examiner has already indicated as being directed to allowable subject matter.

These amendments are solely for the purpose of expediting issuance; the Applicants maintain that the claims of the '777 patent neither disclose nor suggest the limitations of the rejected claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the double-patenting rejections are moot and should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

This amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance, and the Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned agent or attorney David A. Gass, if any questions or remaining issues arise that might be resolved by telephone.

Dated: December 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Jeanne M. Brashear/56,301

Jeanne M. Brashear

Registration No.: 56,301

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Agent for Applicants